DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 906 EF 002 614

AUTHOR	Cedar, Toby
TITLE	Student Housing Survey, Fall 1966.
INSTITUTION	Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich.
PUB DATE	Mar 67
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00
DESCRIPTORS	Building Design, *Campus Planning, *College Housing, Dormitories, Facility Expansion, *Facility Requirements, *Housing Needs, *Housing Patterns, Surveys

ABSTRACT

Information is presented concerning student housing on Wayne State University Campus, in the following sections--(1) present housing arrangements of the students, (2) student attitudes toward living in the University area, (3) students' housing preferences, (4) students' comments on the advantages and disadvantages of a Wayne campus residence, and (5) students' opinions about what a satisfactory housing situation and a livable environment would be like. (FS)

ED037906

STUDENT HOUSING SURVEY
FALL 1966

Toby Cedar
Associate in Research
Office for Institutional Research
Wayne State University
March 1, 1967

EF 002 614

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Student Housing Study: Fall 1966

As part of the planning for the development of student housing on the Wayne State University campus, the Office for Institutional Research conducted a survey of Wayne students during the 1966 Fall term. Its purposes were to find out if students desired to live in the University area and to collect information about the kind of housing they preferred. This paper reports the findings of the survey.

Several kinds of information relating to the primary purposes of the study are covered in this report. First there is a description of the present housing arrangements of the students: the kind of housing in which they live and the distance of their homes from campus. The next section describes student attitudes toward living in the University area and relates these attitudes to certain student characteristics. Following this is an account of the students' housing preferences: the type of residence they prefer and the amount of money they can afford to pay. Finally, the students' comments on the advantages and disadvantages of a Wayne campus residence are presented along with their opinions about what a satisfactory housing situation and a livable environment would be like. The highlights on the following page is a brief summary of the major findings of the study.

Highlights

1. The need for an extensive housing and redevelopment program for the neighborhood surrounding Wayne is emphasized by the fact that 45 per cent of the students who took part in this survey were favorably disposed toward living in the University area and could afford University-built housing, although they reported many disadvantages in the present residential situation. These disadvantages concerned housing and neighborhood more than personal problems. They also saw many factors in locating on campus which would make a positive contribution to their lives as students. The implication is that a large number of students would take advantage of the benefits of living near the University given a desirable residential development.

2. Additional indication of the need for housing is that 11 per cent of the sample lived within two miles of campus. Almost all of this group preferred a campus residence.

3. The student most likely to become a campus resident is a young, unmarried undergraduate. Men and women were equally interested in campus living. The most interest was shown by students with these characteristics: 19 years old (66 per cent), junior in rank (66 per cent), single (61 per cent), and full-time status (62 per cent).

4. A one-bedroom apartment, shared by two, costing $65.00-$75.00, was the first choice of the largest number of students. Two units shared second place: a shared-dormitory room at $40.00-$44.00, and an efficiency apartment for $95.00-$104.00.

Type of Residence

The majority of the students in the sample live with their parents (51 per cent). A sizeable number live in two other types of housing: an apartment or their own home, approximately 19 per cent in each. Table 1 indicates the distribution of the students among types of residence. Approximately 2 per cent of the student body live in University housing. The sample proportion is higher because women were over represented.

TABLE 1

STUDENTS LIVING IN EACH TYPE OF RESIDENCE

Type of Residence	Per Cent
Parental home	51%
Apartment	19
Own house	19
University operated dorm, apartment, or Jeffries	3
Home of relatives or family friends	3
Rented house	2
Room	1
Other	1
	99% *

N	953
NA	13
TOTAL	966

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

As shown by Table 2, of all ranks, freshmen had the largest percentage living in parental homes (78 per cent). The number residing at home declines steadily with increase in rank. The largest percentage of home owners are in the post-degree rank (42 per cent); graduate and professional students are next with 33 per cent. Reflecting the diversity of the Wayne student body, 8 per cent of the freshmen own homes. There is little difference between sophomores, juniors, and seniors in the percentage who live in University operated housing or the Jeffries project. The freshmen percentage living in this kind of housing is lower than that of other undergraduates. Less than 1 per cent of the graduate and professional people and no post-degree students are in this category.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS' RESIDENCE BY RANK

	Rank					
Type of Residence	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate or Professional	Post Degree
Parental home	78%	68%	57%	42%	21%	21%
Apartment	6	10	16	28	34	29
Own house	8	11	14	18	33	42
University operated dorm, apartment, or Jeffries	2	5	6	5	1	-
Home of relatives or family friends	4	3	5	3	2	6
Rented house	-	2	1	2	6	-
Room	1	2	1	1	1	2
Other	-	-	1	2	1	-
Total	99%*	101%*	101%*	101%*	99%*	100%
Base N	207	194	154	131	225	52

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 3

STUDENTS' RESIDENCE BY SEX AND EMPLOYMENT

Type of Residence	Sex		Employment	
	Male	Female	Yes	No
Parental home	50%	53%	48%	58%
Apartment	22	16	22	15
Own home	19	18	21	14
University operated dorm, apartment, or Jeffries	2	5	2	6
Home of relatives or family friends	4	3	4	3
Rented home	2	2	3	2
Room	1	2	1	2
Other	1	-	-	1
Total	101%*	99%*	101%*	101%*
Base N	515	450	620	341

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

Table 3 shows some residence differences between men and women. Women are more likely than men to live in University housing or at home. A larger number of men live in apartments. The percentages of men and women living in their own homes are identical. There are also some differences between employed and unemployed students. Students who work are less likely to live in University housing or at home and more likely to live in an apartment or their own home than unemployed students.

Location

An area eleven to twenty miles from the University contains the largest number of Wayne student residences. Forty per cent indicated that their homes are this distance from campus. Eleven per cent live within two miles of campus and about the same percentage live within a distance of two to five miles. Adding these two groups together, we see that only 21.4 per cent of the students are fairly close to Wayne. Thirty per cent live six to ten miles away and almost 9 per cent are located more than twenty miles from campus. (Table 4)

TABLE 4

THE LOCATION OF STUDENT RESIDENCES

Distance From Campus	Per Cent
Within two miles	11%
Two to five miles	10
Six to ten miles	30
Eleven to twenty miles	40
More than twenty miles	9
	100%
N	953
NA	13
TOTAL	966

Table 5 shows more juniors and seniors living on campus than students in the other ranks, but graduate and professional students and sophomores are comparatively well represented. Since freshmen have the highest percentage living at home, it would be expected that, as shown, fewer freshmen than other ranks live on campus. Finding only 2 per cent of the post-degree students in this area is also expected given their low degree of involvement with the University.

TABLE 5

THE LOCATION OF STUDENT RESIDENCE BY RANK

Distance From Campus	Rank					
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate or Professional	Post Degree
Within two miles	8%	12%	14%	14%	11%	2%
Two to five miles	12	8	11	7	14	4
Six to ten miles	38	30	26	30	25	32
Eleven to twenty miles	37	43	42	39	39	48
More than twenty miles	6	8	7	10	11	14
Total	101%*	101%*	100%	100%	100%	100%
Base N	201	193	153	129	225	50

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 6

THE LOCATION OF STUDENT RESIDENCE BY SEX AND EMPLOYMENT

	Sex		Employment	
Distance From Campus	Male	Female	Yes	No
Within two miles	10%	12%	9%	15%
Two to five miles	10	11	10	10
Six to ten miles	28	32	31	28
Eleven to twenty miles	42	38	40	40
More than twenty miles	9	8	9	8
Total	99%*	101%*	99%*	101%*
Base N	515	438	614	335

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

Table 6 indicates that although the University does not provide housing specifically for men, men are interested in living near campus and manage to find a place to live. Only 2 per cent more women than men live within two miles of the University and there is no difference between the percentage of men and women who live a distance of two to five miles. A comparison with Table 3 shows that the percentage of men and women who live within two miles of the campus is much larger than the percentage living in University housing. For men the difference is 8 per cent, for women it is larger by 7 per cent. Table 6 also shows that unemployed students are more likely to live within two miles of Wayne than working students.

Transportation

As expected, given the distance of their homes, most of the students (70 per cent) use a car to reach the campus. Buses are used by 17 per cent. That most of the students who live within two miles of campus do not have to rely on cars or buses is indicated by the fact that 10 per cent of the students walk to school.

TABLE 7

PER CENT USING DIFFERENT KINDS OF TRANSPORTATION

Kind of Transportation	Per Cent
Car	70%
Bus	17
Walk	10
More than one form	3
Bicycle or motorcycle	-
	100%
N	962
NA	4
TOTAL	966

Desire to Live on Campus

In order to ascertain their attitude toward campus living, the students were asked: "If you were absolutely free to choose, would you like to live in the University area?" The study did not try to probe the actual intentions of these students for several reasons: (1) it was not possible to be specific about what kind of housing would be built or the time at which it would be available, (2) the University neighborhood itself is in a state of flux, and (3) even if a housing plan and time of availability could be specified, any student predictions of their plans two or more years in the future would be extremely unreliable. Therefore, considering the ambiguity of the present housing situation and the unreliability of students' estimates of future housing plans, an attempt was made to discover the attitudes toward locating on campus which would provide an estimate of the maximum potential demand for University housing.

Fifty-four per cent of the sample responded that if they were free to choose they would like to live in the University area. The questionnaire requested information on only one condition which would prevent them from moving on campus, finances. The students were asked to make a selection from a list of housing arrangements which included the cost for each type of housing. They were asked to indicate if they could not afford any of the housing offered. As shown on Table 8, 9 per cent of the sample fell into this group. We find that 45 per cent of the students want and presumably can afford to live on campus. Although money is not a hindrance for these students, they undoubtedly see other problems which would prevent them from living on campus. A small group of the respondents were asked about their interpretation of the question: "If you were absolutely free to choose, would you like to live in the University

TABLE 8

PER CENT OF POTENTIAL CAMPUS AREA RESIDENTS

	Per Cent
Prefer University area and can afford it	45%
Prefer University area but cannot afford it	9
Do not prefer University area	46
	100%
N	957
NA	9
TOTAL	966

area?" It was found that they understood the lack of conditions implied in the question and that conditions did exist which would prevent them from moving onto campus. These hindering conditions included both personal problems and the physical state of the University area and were identical with the disadvantages of living near the University reported by the students on the questionnaires. (Their opinions are discussed in a section below.)

Recognizing that problems exist which would prevent people from acting on their desire, the figure of 45% is the best estimate we can make of the maximum potential market for University housing. We know that if a suitable housing situation is provided, enough students hold attitudes disposing them toward campus living to create a University city. To provide an estimate of the true population percentage we can place the 45 per cent sample estimate in a confidence interval at the 2 per cent significance level. The result is a percentage range within which the population percentage would be found in 98 of every 100 possible samples of this size (957). This percentage range runs

from 41 to 49. Translated into numbers based on the Fall 1966 enrollment of 30,832 from which the sample was drawn, we find that a range of 12,641 to 15,108 includes the number of students in the population who hold favorable attitudes toward campus living.

TABLE 9

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS BY LOCATION

Location	Per Cent Who Want to Live on Campus	Base N
Within two miles	89%	103
Two to five miles	58	98
Six to ten miles	49	282
Eleven to twenty miles	50	380
More than twenty miles	39	82
	N	945
	NA	21
	TOTAL	966

Table 9 shows where the potential Wayne housing residents live in terms of distance from the Wayne campus, and also provides information about the minimum potential market for Wayne housing. The closer students now live to Wayne, the more they desire to live in the University area. Apparently, people who have experienced the advantages of living close to school are reluctant to give them up. This group, which comprises 10 per cent of the sample, has the highest potential to become occupants of Wayne housing. If we surround this figure with a 98 per cent confidence interval we get a range of 8 to 12 per cent. Based on the Fall population total we can say that a number within the range of 2,467 to 3,700 represents the minimum market for campus housing.

TABLE 10

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS AND FINANCIAL SITUATION BY RANK

Rank	Want to Live on Campus	Want to - Cannot Afford	Want to - Can Afford	Base N
Freshman	54%	10%	44%	206
Sophomore	58	10	48	193
Junior	66	13	53	152
Senior	56	10	46	128
Graduate or Professional	44	6	38	225
Post-degree	39	4	35	51

N 955
NA. 11
TOTAL 966

When we examine the students who want to live on campus by their rank in Table 10, we see that more than half of the students in each undergraduate rank would like to live on campus. Juniors are more likely to express this preference (66 per cent) then the other undergraduates. Less than half of the graduate and professional students, and post-degree students prefer a campus residence. When the percentage of each rank desiring to live on campus is adjusted by subtracting from each the percentage who cannot afford to, this overall picture is not altered although the difference between ranks is diminished.

Table 11 shows a relationship between age and desire to live on campus which reinforces and emphasizes the difference between age groups indicated by the analysis of rank. Only 40 per cent of the students who are 17 years

old want to live on campus. The percentage rises with increase in age and reaches a peak (63 per cent) at ages 20 and 21. It then drops steadily until the 50 year old group is reached; 63 per cent of this group want to live on campus.

TABLE 11

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS BY AGE

Age	Per Cent Who Want to Live on Campus	Base N
17	40%	25
18	60	115
19	66	135
20	63	89
21	63	78
22-25	54	259
26-29	42	84
30-39	37	107
40-49	29	45
50-59	63	16
	N	953
	NA	13
	TOTAL	966

Single men and women in the sample favored campus living more than married students without children, and the latter group was more likely to make this choice than married students with children. So far the data indicates that the future residents of the University area will be the younger students -- but not the youngest -- who have reached a level of maturity or independence which disposes them to live away from home; students who are not about to graduate, or who have not yet married and taken on other responsibilities which could replace school as the primary focus of their lives.

If, as is being suggested, the desire to live on campus is primarily a result of the degree to which the student's time and energy is invested in his school life, tempered by maturity, we would expect that those students who carry full-time programs would be more likely to desire a campus residence than part-time students. Table 12 shows this to be the case.

TABLE 12

DESIRE TO LIVE IN THE CAMPUS AREA BY CREDIT HOURS CARRIED

Credit Hours	Per Cent Who Want to Live on Campus	Base N
0- 3	22%	32
4- 7	34	189
8-11	47	137
12-15	60	322
16-21	67	270
	N	950
	NA	16
	TOTAL	966

Since this relationship could be merely a reflection of the fact that younger students carry more credit hours (see Appendix Table B) and, as indicated above, are more favorably disposed toward campus living, we next examine the relationship between age, full-time/part-time status[1] and the desire to live in the University area. We find on Table 13 that the number of hours carried is more important than age.

---

[1] Undergraduates and post-degree students are defined as full-time if they carry at least 12 credit hours, graduate and professional students are full-time if they carry at least 8 credit hours.

TABLE 13

STUDENTS IN EACH AGE GROUP BY
FULL-TIME/PART-TIME STATUS WHO WANT TO LIVE ON CAMPUS

Age	Full-time		Part-time	
17	44%	(23)*	0%	(2)
18	61	(110)	40	(5)
19	66	(128)	57	(7)
20	62	(79)	70	(10)
21	64	(64)	54	(13)
22-25	65	(154)	39	(100)
26-29	56	(34)	31	(49)
30-39	59	(34)	27	(73)
40-49	36	(11)	27	(34)
50-59	100	(1)	60	(15)

* ( ) = base N for the percentage.

Within each age except one (age 20) the full-time student group contains a larger percentage of people who want to live on campus than the part-time group. Note, too, that the full-time students are not influenced by age as much as the part-time students.

TABLE 14

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS BY EMPLOYMENT

Employed	Per Cent Who Want to Live on Campus	Base N
Yes	51%	617
No	58	337
	N	954
	NA	12
	TOTAL	966

A second way to examine the importance of the number of credit hours a student carries is to look at employment, full-time/part-time status, and the desire to live on campus. From Table 14 we see that more unemployed students would prefer a campus residence. Yet when, on Table 15, full-time/part-time status is controlled within each employment group we see that number of credit hours taken is more important than being employed.

TABLE 15

PER CENT OF STUDENTS IN EACH EMPLOYMENT GROUP BY FULL-TIME/PART-TIME STATUS WHO WANT TO LIVE ON CAMPUS

Employed	Full-time		Part-time	
Yes	63%	(342)*	37%	(270)
No	62	(296)	31	(39)

* ( ) = base N for the percentages.

We find that regardless of whether they were employed, full-time students are more likely to want to live on campus. This relationship between credit hours carried, regardless of age or employment, and the desire to live on campus, suggests that the primary factor in a student's decision to live on campus will be his degree of involvement in the University.

Housing Selections

Thirty-six per cent of the sample (352 students) made housing choices. One-quarter of this group selected the single-student, one-bedroom apartment shared by two as their first choice. The preferred price range was $65.00 to $75.00. The next two most popular units, each selected by 17 per cent, were the shared dormitory room and the efficiency apartment both offered for the single student. The favored price range for the efficiency apartment was $95.00 to $104.00; for the dormitory room, the two lowest prices offered ($40.00 to $44.00 and $45.00 to $49.00) were equally chosen. The popularity of these units reflects the preference of married students for off-campus housing. The selections were made primarily by single students. More than half of the students selected one of these three units as their first choice (see Table 16).

TABLE 16

Favored Housing Units

Unit	Favored by:
Single student - one bedroom apartment, shared by two	25%
Single student - efficiency apartment	18
Single student shared dormitory room	17
Other	40
	100%
N . . .	352

The unit which appealed to the largest percentage of single men and women was the one-bedroom apartment, shared by two; however, it was more popular with men. The shared-dormitory room and efficiency apartment ranked second

and third, with the latter less favored by women. The next two units, preferred by fewer students, the two-bedroom apartment, shared by four and the single-occupancy dormitory room, were of more interest to women than men.

The number of married students who made housing selections is so small (61) that an analysis of their responses is of doubtful value. However, it is worth noting that both men and women favored the two-bedroom co-op townhouse; 68 per cent of the women and 48 per cent of the men selected this unit as their first choice. (See Appendix Tables E and F.)

COMMENTS ON THE PRESENT STATE AND POSSIBILITIES OF CAMPUS LIVING

The students were asked to give their opinions about the advantages and disadvantages of campus living, the kind of housing they would like to have, and the public facilities they felt would be desirable.

Advantages

Easier access to professors, the University library, to classes, and other University facilities were the most frequently mentioned advantages of living on campus. Just being in an environment with many academic and cultural activities is desirable. Many students identified campus living with an increase in their participation in many activities and more specifically with an improvement in their social life; they thought campus living would be more conducive to forming friendships, and to participating in social activities. They perceived a savings in time and some saw they would have additional time to spend at the library, at other University facilities or for studying. Reduction in transportation problems such as, travel time, parking problems, and transportation costs was important to them.

Disadvantages

The major disadvantage the students saw in campus living was the condition of the neighborhood surrounding Wayne. They described it as dirty and unattractive, with too much traffic and congestion, and inadequate housing. They objected to living among the poor. Their primary criticism of the area had to do with the prevalence of crime. They also noted the lack of certain essential facilities: parking, shopping and other services, good restaurants, and recreational facilities.

In addition to the general neighborhood, the campus itself has limitations for some people. Because student activities are limited in number, campus residents have an unsatisfactory social life. On the other hand, some thought that the

Table 17

Advantages of Living on Campus

Comments	Percentage
Easier access to University library, classes, professors, other University facilities	27.5%
Reduction of transportation and parking problems, and transportation costs	14.5
Saves time in general or saves travel time	11.8
Improvement of student social life, e.g., conducive to forming friendships, participation in social activities	11.2
Being in an environment with many academic and cultural activities	10.5
Time saved - spent at library, other University facilities, or used for studying	3.9
Campus is conducive to study	3.8
References to unspecified activities, e.g., closer to activities, can participate in more activities	3.6
Separation from family, e.g., encourages independence, responsibility, privacy	3.3
Convenience	3.1
Close to downtown, e.g., shopping, theatres	2.5
References to campus atmosphere, e.g., enjoy campus atmosphere	1.0
Other	3.4
Total	100.1%*
Base N	1575 +

* Does not total 100% because of rounding.

+ N = The number of comments.

Table 18

Disadvantages of Living On Campus

Comments	Percentage
Unspecified negative comments about the neighborhood, or descriptions such as unattractive, bad, dirty, or objections to poverty, traffic, congestion, noise, residents	27.1%
Crime, rough neighborhood	21.7
Too expensive, e.g., high prices, it would cost me more to live, the cost	7.4
Environment, including housing, not suitable for raising children, e.g., schools, playmates, play facilities, neighborhood	6.3
Housing facilities poor or too expensive	5.4
Parking problems	5.1
Loss of contact with family and/or friends, neighborhood activities, associates, interests	3.7
Too far from employment	3.4
Inadequate shopping and service facilities	3.2
Lack of student social life and school spirit, extra-curricular activities, impersonality on campus	2.6
Campus life is restrictive in terms of the limitation of experience and exposure or regulations imposed by the University	2.0
Lack of good food service	1.7
Lack of recreational facilities	1.7
Campus atmosphere not conducive to study, e.g., friends, activities	1.4
Lack of privacy	1.2
The responsibilities of being on one's own, away from family, e.g., preparing meals, doing laundry, doing house cleaning	1.2
Other	4.9
Total	100.0%
Base N	884 +

+ N = The number of comments.

presence of friends and activities would have the negative effect of distracting them from their studies. Lack of privacy was mentioned as a disadvantage. Some students thought that campus life would be restrictive either because experience and exposure to other ways of living would be limited or because of restrictions imposed by the University.

A third group of comments focused on the inability of some students to move on campus because, if they did, they could not maintain their present way of life. The environment is considered unsuitable for raising children because of a lack in schools, playmates, play areas, or the neighborhood in general. For some, a change in location would result in loss of contact with family or friends, or the disruption of neighborhood-based interests and activities. An increase in the distance from the place of employment is a disadvantage in a campus residence. Some students mentioned that the cost would be prohibitive for them. A few noted with disfavor that living on campus would force them to do certain tasks like cooking and cleaning which are now done for them.

Housing and Housing Features

The students were interested in a variety of housing; apartments, dormitories, and houses were mentioned with apartments being the most popular. Many comments were made about the adequacy of various structural features of the buildings and about the desirability of low rent. They were also concerned with the maintenance of the buildings. Some of the features the students would like to see included in student housing are parking facilities, food services which would serve good, reasonably priced food, recreation areas, study areas, kitchen facilities, and laundry areas. A few mentioned the need for adequate building security. Some students pointed out the need to integrate whatever housing is built into a total college community.

Table 19

Housing and Housing Features

Comments	Percentages
Concern for the adequacy of structual features, e.g., air conditioning, sound proofing, wiring, lighting fixtures, plumbing, closet space storage, spacious rooms, modern buildings, or attractiveness	14.4%
Low rent	14.1
Apartments, general reference or specific mention of one-bedroom apartments	11.6
Dormitories	7.5
Clean, well-maintained buildings	6.0
Parking facilities connected with housing	4.7
Housing which is part of a college community, e.g., must be close to the campus, sufficient housing to comprise a student community	4.6
Separate housing for adult students, e.g., married students, graduate students, over 21, upper classmen	4.5
Food services connected with housing should provide good, reasonably-priced, food	3.4
Mentions of houses including co-op or condominium housing, townhouse	3.1
Recreation areas in the housing	3.0
Adequate building security provisions and regulations	3.0
Housing unit should contain laundry facilities	2.6
Kitchen facilities	2.1
Furnishings provided	2.0
Apartments with two or more bedrooms	1.9
Privacy and quiet	1.8
Study areas	1.7
Other	8.1
Total	100.1%*
Base N	1215+

* Does not total 100% because of rounding.

+ N = The number of comments.

Public Facilities and Services

A large number of the comments pointed out the need for better shopping in the neighborhood. The students want more grocery stores, laundromats, cleaners, and bookstores; and they would like to have better quality merchandise on sale in the shops, reasonable prices, and longer hours. They see a need for more places for leisure activities; places which provide entertainment or lounging space, and both indoor and outdoor recreation areas. In addition, more activities for students should be offered. Additional areas for studying, practice rooms for musicians, studios for painters are also desired.

Some facilities specifically for children are mentioned. Parks, play areas, and good schools receive some attention. Certain child-care services like nursery schools and baby-sitting services are desired by a few.

Many students think that public safety must be increased. A few mention the need for better lighting. Additional public parking facilities are desired. Frequent references were made to the need for an improvement in the physical appearance of the University area or a change in the social composition of the neighborhood.

Table 20

Public Facilities and Services

Comments	Percentage
Better shopping, e.g., conveniently located shopping areas, including grocery stores, laundromats, dry cleaners, bookstores, etc., reasonable prices, better quality products on sale, open longer hours	14.3%
Increase in public safety, elimination of crime	13.6
Change in the physical appearance of the University neighborhood, e.g., slum clearance, clean-up, improved appearance, or change in the social composition of neighborhood	8.3
Indoor recreational facilities, e.g., more and/or longer hours	7.7
Additional public parking facilities	7.7
Additional and/or better restaurants or cafeterias with some mention of longer hours	6.9
Parks, malls, or outdoor recreational areas	4.6
More facilities like theatres, dairy bars, coffee houses, etc.	4.4
More activities planned for students, e.g., recreational, social, cultural, educational events	4.2
Improved public transportation -- both on campus and between campus and other areas	4.2
Study areas, practice rooms for musicians, studios for painters, libraries	4.0
More social or recreational areas in University buildings, e.g., lounges, student center	3.8
Good schools	3.3
Better lighting in area	2.8
Parks and play areas for children	2.1
Longer hours for Detroit Library (main), and/or W.S.U. Library and/or Art Institute	1.9
Expanded health service	1.5
Child care, e.g., nursery schools, baby-sitting services, child-care centers	1.5
Other	3.2
Total	100.0%
Base N	755+

+ N = The number of comments.

Conclusion

A sample of 966 students took part in a housing survey in Fall 1966. A large percentage of this sample indicated they would like to live on the campus. Finances would prohibit few, who desire to do so, from this move; only 9 per cent of the sample indicated money would be a problem.

The most popular housing unit was the one-bedroom apartment, shared by two, for single students. The efficiency apartment and shared dormitory room were next in popularity. Most of the married students who selected units choose the two-bedroom co-op town house. There were only small differences between the preferences of men and women.

Campus living is equally attractive to men and women but marital status is an important factor. Single students show the greatest interest; married students with no children are less inclined to find the University area desirable, and, if they have children, their interest drops even more. The older and youngest students are least likely to become campus residents. The greatest interest is expressed by students in their junior year. This could be a result of two factors: the maturation process and the degree of involvement in the University. It is possible that students, when freshman, are still family oriented and dependent; eventually they become more campus-oriented and independent and the desire to live on campus is strong. The next step in time is marriage or the necessity of locating a job after graduation. The campus loses its interest and becomes, given the requirements of family living or other adult responsibilities, irrelevant.

The bias of the present student body should provide the context for interpreting the 45 per cent sample estimate of potential campus residents. To most Wayne students the provision of housing is unimportant. If they had

to live in University housing they would be at other schools. The sample was drawn from students, then, who would not have a need for University housing. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to question students who would have come to Wayne if suitable housing were available, yet those students are a part of the group of potential Wayne residents. The sample estimate is conservative because those who would favor a campus residence were omitted from the sample. Experience in both undergraduate and graduate admissions indicates that interested students are discouraged from applying to Wayne by the lack of adequate housing. The availability of campus housing would have the circular effect of bringing more people to the campus who want to live on campus. If housing is built, the number of students who want to live on campus should increase.

Another factor to consider is that the questionnaire oriented the student to future development in the University area. The students were asked to make a decision about living on campus within a framework of a changing environment. Had they been asked to make this decision given the present conditions of the University area the number desiring to live in the area would surely have been lower. It was pointed out that the students who now live in the University area (within two miles of campus) were the most enthusiastic about locating on campus. Present conditions do not discourage them, therefore, few changes need be made on their behalf. However, the other students who want to live on campus but do not now do so, would probably require more environmental change to convert their desire to action. It is likely that if one wanted to attract all 45 per cent of those who said they want to live on campus, major changes, along the lines suggested by the students, would have to be made.

APPENDIX

Sample Selection and Population Comparison

A questionnaire was mailed to 1624 students randomly selected from all Fall registrants. A 59 per cent response (966 respondents) was received. The sample of 966 was compared to the population for its representativeness on the basis of six characteristics: college of enrollment, full-time/part-time status, rank, marital status, age, and sex. The sex, full-time/part-time status, and rank distribution in the sample differed significantly from that in the population. Forty-seven per cent of the respondents were women while the population percentage was 42. Graduate and professional students were under represented in the sample by 6 per cent. Full-time students were over represented in the sample by 6 per cent. On the other three characteristics; college of enrollment, age, and marital status, there were no significant differences between the sample and the Fall term students.

TABLE A

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS
BY SEX-MARITAL STATUS

Sex-Marital Status	Per Cent Who Want to Live on Campus	Base N
Women: widowed, divorced, separated	63 %	16
Men: single	61	337
Women: single	61	304
Men: married-no children	49	71
Women: married-no children	41	46
Women: married-one or more children	35	79
Men: married-one or more children	28	100
Men: widowed, divorced, separated	25	4

N 957
NA. . . . 9
TOTAL . . 966

TABLE B

CREDIT HOURS CARRIED
BY AGE

Age	Per Cent Who Carried at Least 12 Credit Hours	Base N
17	92 %	25
18	96	115
19	95	135
20	89	90
21	72	78
22-25	51	257
26-29	28	85
30-39	24	108
40-49	15	45
50-59	6	18
	N	956
	NA. . . .	10
	TOTAL . .	966

TABLE C

DESIRE TO LIVE ON CAMPUS BY
FULL-TIME/PART-TIME STATUS*

Status	Per Cent Desiring to Live on Campus	Base N
Part-time	36 %	310
Full-time	62	639
	N	949
	NA	17
	TOTAL	966

* Undergraduates and post-degree students are defined as full-time if they carry at least 12 credit hours; graduate and professional students are full-time if they carry at least 8 credit hours.

TABLE D

TYPE OF HOUSING PREFERRED BY STUDENTS
WHO DESIRED AND COULD AFFORD
TO LIVE IN THE UNIVERSITY AREA

Type of Housing [a]		Per Cent
Single Student Housing		
Shared dormitory room		
Cost: $40.00-44.00		6 %
45.00-49.00		6
50.00-54.00		3
55.00-59.00		2
Sub-Total	17 %	
Single dormitory room		
Cost: $60.00-64.00		5
65.00-69.00		1
70.00-74.00		1
75.00-79.00		1
Sub-Total	8 %	
Efficiency apartment--single occupancy		
Cost: $ 95.00-104.00		15
105.00-114.00		2
115.00-124.00		1
Sub-Total	18 %	
One bedroom apartment--shared by two		
Cost: $65.00-75.00		20
76.00-85.00		5
Sub-Total	25 %	
Two bedroom apartment--shared by four		
Cost: $40.00-44.00		3
45.00-49.00		3
50.00-54.00		1
55.00-59.00		2
Sub-Total	9 %	
Shared room in coop house, organized and managed by students		
Cost: $46.00-50.00		6
Sub-Total	6 %	

Type of Housing [a]		Per Cent
Married Student Housing		
Efficiency apartment		
Cost: $ 95.00-104.00		1%
105.00-114.00		-
115.00-124.00		-
Sub-Total	1%	
One bedroom apartment		
Cost: $120.00-129.00		2
130.00-139.00		-
140.00-149.00		-
Sub-Total	2%	
Two bedroom apartment		
Cost: $145.00-154.00		1
155.00-164.00		1
165.00-174.00		-
Sub-Total	2%	
One bedroom townhouse, in coop; owned building, unfurnished except appliances, small investment required		
Cost: $90.00-105.00		3
Sub-Total	3%	
Two bedroom townhouse as described above		
Cost: $110.00-120.00		10
Sub-Total	10%	
	101% *	101% *

N.	352
Prefer University area: NA on housing. .	74
Prefer University area: cannot afford. .	87
Do not prefer University area.	444
NA on University area preference	9
TOTAL.	966

[a] Students who indicated that they wanted to live in the University area were asked to select from a list their housing preferences and the maximum rent they could pay for each unit they choose. Prices for single-student housing are monthly cost per student. Married-student housing prices are monthly cost per unit. This table lists the first choice of the students.

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

TABLE E

SINGLE STUDENT HOUSING PREFERENCES
BY SEX-MARITAL STATUS

Sex-Marital Status	Shared Dorm. Room	Single Dorm. Room	Eff. Apt.-Single Occ.	One Bedroom Apt.-Shared by Two	Two Bedroom Apt.-Shared by Four	Shared Room in Coop House	Total	Base N
Men: single	21%	7%	22%	34%	10%	5%	99%*	156
Women: single	20	12	17	29	12	10	100	123
Women: widowed, divorced, separated			100				100	4
Women: married	100						100	1
						N		284

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.

TABLE F

MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING PREFERENCES
BY SEX-MARITAL STATUS

Sex-Marital Status	Eff. Apt.	One Bedroom Apt.	Two Bedroom Apt.	One Bedroom Coop Townhouse	Two Bedroom Coop Townhouse	Total	Base N
Men: single	33%	33%			33%	99%*	3
Women: single	50				50	100	2
Men: married	3	12	21	21	42	99*	33
Women: married	4	14	7	7	68	100	28
Men: widowed, divorced, separated			100			100	1
Women: widowed, divorced, separated				100		100	1
						N	68

* Total differs from 100% because of rounding.